REMARKS

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application No. 08217686 A ("JP '686"). In response, the claims of the current application have been amended to include elements not present in JP '686. Specifically, the present invention claims a method comprising "blocking carcinogen-induced DNA adduct formation, scavenging free radicals, quenching lipid hydroproxides, and selectively inhibiting COX-2." JP '686 does not claim or teach a method comprising "blocking carcinogen-induced DNA adduct formation, scavenging free radicals, quenching lipid hydroproxides, and selectively inhibiting COX-2." Because JP '686 does not teach all of the elements claimed in the present invention, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by JP '686.

Claims 1-28 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4, 039, 559 ("the '559 patent") and U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0068102 (filed Dec. 1, 2000) ("the '102 application"). In response, the claims of the current application have been amended to include elements not present in of the prior art cited. Specifically, the present invention claims a method comprising "blocking carcinogen-induced DNA adduct formation, scavenging free radicals, quenching lipid hydroproxides, and selectively inhibiting COX-2." The '559 patent teaches that carbon tetrachloride causes liver damage due to its ability to produce harmful free radicals. The '102 application teaches that *M. citrifolia* is an antioxidant. However, the '559 patent and '102 application do not teach a method comprising "blocking carcinogen-induced DNA adduct formation, scavenging free radicals, quenching lipid hydroproxides, and selectively inhibiting COX-2." Because the '559 patent and the '102

application do not teach all of the elements claimed in the present invention, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the '559 patent and the '102 application.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the deficiencies in the application have been corrected and that the proposed claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art reference cited by the Examiner. As such, Applicant believes that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

If any impediments to the allowance of this application for patent remain after the above amendments and remarks are entered, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned attorney of record.

DATED this 7 day of July, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael F. Krieger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,232

KIRTON & MCCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 328-3600 telephone
(801) 321-4893 facsimile

JRM/jb
#765600 v1 - Response to Office Action (103)